

SUMMARY OF STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING(S)

DATE: March 28, 2002
TO: Ross Dunfee, Steering Committee Chairman
Tony Barrett, Department of Ecology
COPY: Steering Committee Members and Consultant Team
FROM: Dave Moss, Tt/KCM
SUBJECT: **Summary of Steering Committee Meeting(s)**
Moses Lake Conference Center
March 14, 2002 9:00am - 10:00am & 2:30pm - 3:30pm
PROJECT: EASTERN WASHINGTON STORMWATER MANAGEMENT
Stormwater Management Technical Manual *and*
Model Municipal NPDES Phase II Stormwater Program

Morning Meeting Attendees

<u>Steering Committee</u>	<u>Others Attending</u>
Role call was not taken; this was a joint meeting for all in attendance, including the Steering Committee, Manual Subcommittee, and NPDES Phase II Subcommittee.	Ecology, project consultant team, agency representatives, other consultants and interested persons (see separate meeting summaries for lists of the day's attendees.)

PURPOSE OF MORNING (9:00am to 10:00am) MEETING:

The meeting was held, before the concurrent Subcommittee meetings, to share information and discuss key issues.

AGENDA FOR MORNING (9:00am to 10:00am) MEETING:

1. Welcome by Ross Dunfee; introductions by all attendees
2. Non-Point Source Workshop in Spokane on April 9-11 (EA WA team presentation on April 9 in afternoon), and confirm date and location for April meeting in Moses Lake
3. Status of HB2847 and HB2866
4. UIC status update from Ecology

BRIEF SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS:

1. Ross Dunfee welcomed all in attendance and noted this joint meeting (before the Subcommittee meetings), was felt to be important, based upon several key topics (as per the agenda listed above). All persons in the room introduced himself or herself.

2. Ross reiterated there is a Non-Point Source Conference in Spokane on April 9-11, 2002. A copy of the draft agenda was handed out to those who didn't receive it last meeting. There were 3 main issues to discuss:
 - a. The Eastern Washington stormwater program is on the agenda for the afternoon on April 9. Who will represent our group? – Ross confirmed himself, Tony Barrett, John Knutson, Steve Worley, Dave Moss, Greg Lahti, Chris Waarvick, and Lloyd Brewer. A lunch break meeting was scheduled to discuss details.
 - b. Is anyone else attending the Conference on any or all of the days? – Several people said yes.
 - c. What day (and where) should we hold the April meeting? (originally scheduled for April 11 in Moses Lake). – It was confirmed for Friday, April 12 in Moses Lake.
3. Ross discussed the status of HB2847, which would create an independent science panel for evaluation of environmental regulations. He said it had died in committee. House Bill 2866 passed out of the House and Senate. This bill addresses the connection between HPAs and municipal NPDES permits.
4. Bill Moore of Ecology stated that the NPDES Phase II permit will not address most classes of drywells. Ecology will define the class of drywells that are “rule-authorized”, i.e., possibly residential and roadway installations. Also, jurisdictions with no discharge to surface water will not be required to obtain coverage under the Phase II permit. Although drywells will not be covered by the Phase II permit, it was suggested that evaluation and design procedures for them remain in the Manual. Using a risk-based approach to be developed by Ecology, the manual would describe the “how to” for drywell design and use. Tony Barrett suggested that a working committee of the Manual Subcommittee be put together to assist in the creation of drywell guidelines with Mary Shaleen-Hansen of Ecology. A few related issues were raised and some were discussed:
 - a. State law requires that both surface water and groundwater must be addressed any time a permit is issued.
 - b. If there is normally no discharge to surface water, except for during larger storms, is the NPDES Phase II permit required? - YES
 - c. It was asked whether the NPDES compliance timeline could be met if drywells were addressed separately? The question wasn't really discussed, nor confirmed one way or the other.
5. Ross then concluded the morning session and sent the subcommittees to their respective meetings.

Afternoon Meeting Attendees (Steering Committee / Management / Consultant Team):

<u>Steering Committee</u>	<u>Others Attending</u>
Ross Dunfee – Benton County	Tony Barrett – Ecology
Steve Worley – Spokane County	Dave Moss – TetraTech/KCM
Lloyd Brewer – City of Spokane	John Kosco – TetraTech
John Knutson – Yakima County	Jim St. John – DEA
Nancy Aldrich – City of Richland	Doug Busko – DEA
Tom Tebb – Ecology (absent)	Sarah Hubbard-Gray – HGC
Jim Sietz – AWC	
Jim Ajax – City of Wenatchee	Several others were in attendance, after
Michelle Brich – Tri-Cities Homebuilders	participating in the Subcommittee meetings
David Sypher – City of Chelan (absent)	earlier in the day, however their names were
Gary Beeman – WSDOT	not separately recorded for this meeting.

PURPOSE OF AFTERNOON (2:30pm to 3:30pm) MEETING:

The meeting was held, after the concurrent Subcommittee meetings, to share information and discuss key issues.

AGENDA FOR AFTERNOON (2:30pm to 3:30pm) MEETING:

1. Roll call by Ross Dunfee; introductions by others attending
2. Review summary of prior month's meeting; approve
3. Summary of Subcommittee meeting discussion, by John Knutson (NPDES) and Steve Worley (Manual)
4. Distribute copy of Newsletter No. 1
5. Status of "issue paper" topics; FTP site status; process for incorporating edits; optional services status
6. Discussion of overall project schedule, including Open Houses
7. Next meeting: date, time, place and agenda topics

BRIEF SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS:

1. Ross Dunfee completed a roll call for the 10 Steering Committee members, with David Sypher and Tom Tebb not attending. Ray Latham was there to take notes on behalf of Tom Tebb, but did not vote. Therefore, there were eight members present at the meeting. Others in the room introduced himself or herself.
2. Ross asked for comments/edits to the February 14, 2002 meeting summary; none were received.
3. Ross requested a vote of the Steering Committee regarding the following question: Are the documents being prepared just the minimum documents to meet NPDES?
 - A1. For the NPDES Phase II Model Program (Permit) – Of the eight members present, there were 7 "YES" votes and 1 "NO" vote.
 - A2. For the Stormwater Technical MANUAL – There was discussion regarding clarifications to the intention and the phrasing of the question. This included suggestions that no threshold be stricter than NPDES requirements, and specifying that the Manual is a "Toolbox Only." No vote was taken for the Manual at this time, since Ecology offered to write a position paper on their intention for the Manual to be used only as a reference document to support the regulatory requirements in the Permit.
4. Steve Worley (chair of the Subcommittee for Stormwater Management Technical Manual) summarized their meeting discussion, which is provided in a separate document. [In summary, Steve noted the Subcommittee had discussed the water quality design storm, had been introduced to the key topics of Issue Papers #1, #2 and #4, had considered rearranging some chapters, and discussed the erosivity waiver applicability. Steve also mentioned the Subcommittee had reviewed Chapter 7 – Construction Stormwater Pollution Prevention.]
5. John Knutson (chair of the Subcommittee for NPDES Phase II Model Program) summarized their meeting discussion, which is provided in a separate document. [In summary, John first noted the status of each chapter: (1) Introduction not started; (2) reviewed Public Education; (3) almost reviewed Public Involvement; (4) reviewed Illicit Connections; (5) reviewed Construction Site Runoff Control; (6) reviewed Post Construction Runoff Control; and (7) reviewed Pollution Prevention / Good Housekeeping. BMPs and the second draft of Chapter 7 would be reviewed next meeting. John also noted that their subcommittee's favorite word of the day was "squishy."]
6. Sarah Hubbard-Gray distributed a color laser-printed copy of Newsletter No. 1 and asked if additional copies would be needed for mailings, meetings, conferences, etc. Ross requested 100 for his use. Tony Barrett said he would try to arrange for more to be printed. The newsletter will be posted on the Ecology website.

7. Ross referenced the Issue Papers, and it was noted that Issue Paper #3 – Drywells would be presented in April by Ecology. [An “issue paper” listing is included below.]
8. Dave Moss mentioned the FTP site was still the same and had not changed yet. Stay tuned for future notice of the impending change. Dave also discussed the process for incorporating edits. It was agreed that formal comment and edit notation would not be done until the document was out for public review. Next Dave asked whether any of the optional services, such as the proposed 2nd public review and creation of presentation materials were desired. At this time it was decided there were no extra funds available, so no 2nd public review is scheduled at this time. Finally, Dave mentioned the Open Houses needed to be scheduled if they were to be held in June. The Steering Committee decided to delay them until September and asked Dave to review the entire project schedule and present a revision at the next meeting. Sarah said she would prepare a “proposal” for the future Open Houses so the committee could consider coordination needs and details.
9. For the **next meeting** (Moses Lake Conference Center on **Friday, April 12, 2002** from 3:30pm to 4:30 pm):
 - ❖ Hear summaries of the two Subcommittee meetings
 - ❖ Review the updated Project Schedule
 - ❖ Discuss status of Issue Paper #3 for Drywells
 - ❖ Confirm date/time/place for May committee meetings

**Eastern Washington Stormwater Management
Issue Papers as of January 10, 2002**

The following issue papers are to be developed by researching readily available data, consulting with cities and state agencies, and reviewing other manuals. The consultant will then prepare a brief summary of the issues and possible options, and provide a recommendation for each.

1. Determine the area of pollutant generating impervious area that should be used as a threshold for requiring water quality BMPs on parcels 1 acre or larger. [If nothing is stated, then 1 square foot may trigger the design.]
2. Determine when/if flow control should be provided when discharging to surface waters. [Are certain named water bodies and/or sizes of water bodies not impacted by the increased flows and are therefore recommended for exemption from flow control?]
3. Develop guidelines for determining when new drywells should have pretreatment and when drywells should not be allowed. [The basis for these guidelines will be the research that Ecology and the cities have done for the Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas.]
4. Determine what size/type of storm should be utilized for a water quality storm and that would capture approximately 90% of the pollutants. [Options include: (a) percent of storm events, (b) percent of annual rainfall, and (c) percent of regular storms.]